

in view of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,534,202); and claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kido in view of Aziz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,811,896). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Kido fails to disclose an electro-optic device or a method to manufacture an electro-optic device having an electron injection layer including at least a first metal compound and a second metal compound, as generally recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Kido fails to disclose all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 10 because Kido's metal doping layer 5 is disclosed to have a donor dopant that is a single metal. See Kido at col. 8, lines 5-6. Kido does not disclose a donor dopant having a first metal compound and a second metal compound, as claimed. Kido does not disclose, teach, or suggest that more than one of the materials identified at col. 8, lines 2-9, can be used for a given electron injection layer.

Furthermore, the Office Action at page 2 asserts that plural type anodes, cathodes, and luminescent layers are inherent from Kido's structure, but the Office Action does not provide rationale or evidence showing inherency. "The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic." See MPEP §2114(IV) (emphasis supplied). "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." See MPEP §2112(IV) (emphasis supplied). Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action cannot properly rely on inherency because the Office Action fails to provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning supporting a determination of inherency.

The Office Action also asserts at page 2 that "it is inherent from Kido's structure since making an array of displays such [as] disclosed by applicant would require the use [of] plurality of anode, cathode and luminescent layers in [the] Kido device" (emphasis added).

The Office Action thus asserts that Applicant's invention determines what is or is not inherent in Kido. Applicant respectfully submits that it is impermissible hindsight to use Applicant's invention to interpret Kido or to apply Kido in any rejection.

In view of the foregoing, Kido and Kido in combination with any of the cited secondary references fail to disclose all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 10, as well as the additional features recited in the dependent claims thereof. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven W. Allis
Registration No. 50,532

JAO:SWA/jam

Attachment:

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Date: October 28, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--